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Reviewer's report:

The finding is interesting and the research approach is well described. However, there are some issues in the interpretation of the findings and their significance that could be better addressed. Specifically, there is little reflection on the gendered differences in symptom profiles and adaptation on a PTSD sample. The paper could look at both positive and negative adaptations to trauma and the domains of this as shaped by gender identification. The capacity for emotional expression and regulation in women may be a protective factor in terms of disability. Deficits in emotional expression and regulation in men be a risk factor.

The discussion should also discuss the gendered nature of trauma in that women's experience of sexual and interpersonal trauma shapes processes of adaptation and survival. It is simplistic to assume that having more male attributes is a positive protective effect.

A control sole of interpersonal trauma would be of interest.

With reworking of the discussion this is a useful paper.
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Does the work include the necessary controls?
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Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the data shown?
If not, please explain in your comments to the authors.
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Are you able to assess any statistics in the manuscript or would you recommend an additional statistical review?
If an additional statistical review is recommended, please specify what aspects require further assessment in your comments to the editors.
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